arXiv:hep-th/9409119v1 20 Sep 1994

September, 1994
UPR-623-T

SUPERSYMMETRIC DYONIC BLACK HOLES IN KALUZA-KLEIN THEORY

Mirjam Cvetič[⋆] and Donam Youm[†]

Physics Department
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia PA 19104-6396

ABSTRACT

We study supersymmetric, four-dimensional (4-d), Abelian charged black holes (BH's) arising in (4+n)-d ($1 \leq n \leq 7$) Kaluza-Klein (KK) theories. Such solutions, which satisfy supersymmetric Killing spinor equations (formally satisfied for any n) and saturate the corresponding Bogomol'nyi bounds, can be obtained if and only if the isometry group of the internal space is broken down to the $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$ gauge group; they correspond to dyonic BH's with electric Q and magnetic P charges associated with *different* $U(1)$ factors. The internal metric of such configurations is diagonal with $(n-2)$ internal radii constant, while the remaining two radii (associated with the respective electric and magnetic $U(1)$ gauge fields) and the 4-d part of the metric turn out to be independent of n, *i.e.*, solutions are effectively those of supersymmetric 4-d BH's of 6-d KK theory. For $Q \neq 0$ and $P \neq 0$, 4-d space-time has a null singularity, finite temperature ($T_H \propto 1/\sqrt{|QP|}$) and zero entropy. Special cases with either $Q = 0$ or $P = 0$ correspond to the supersymmetric 4-d BH's of 5-d KK theory, first derived by Gibbons and Perry, which have a naked singularity and infinite temperature.

[⋆] E-mail address: cvetic@cvetic.hep.upenn.edu
[†] E-mail address: youm@cvetic.hep.upenn.edu

1. Introduction

An important feature of a soliton, which is defined as a time-independent solution of classical equations of motion with a finite energy in a non-linear field theory, is that it saturates the Bogomol'nyi bound for its energy. This bound is determined by the topological charge for a type of configurations. The soliton configuration with a given topological charge is stable against decay into another configuration with a different topological charge. In flat space-time the Bogomol'nyi bound[1] for the energy of the configuration can be obtained by completing the square of the energy density T_{tt} of the configuration. The soliton satisfies the first-order differential equations, the so-called Bogomol'nyi or self-dual equations.

The energy‡ of a configuration in an asymptotically flat or (anti-) De Sitter§ space-time is given by the ADM mass,[2] which is defined in terms of a surface integral of the conserved current $J^\mu = T^{\mu\nu}K_\nu$ over a space-like hypersurface at spatial infinity. Here $T^{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum tensor density and K_ν is a time-like Killing vector of the asymptotic space-time. Efforts[3,4] have been made to prove the positivity of the ADM mass of gravitating systems, *i.e.*, the so-called positive-energy theorems, thereby proving that the background space-time is the lowest-energy stable state. Such proofs involve[4] the evaluation of the surface integral of the corresponding Nester's two-form and the volume integral of its covariant divergence. Both integrals are related through the Stokes theorem. The Nester's two-form is defined in terms of a bi-linear in a spinor, which is assumed to satisfy Witten's condition, and a gravitational covariant derivative acting on the same spinor. The surface integral yields the ADM mass for the corresponding system and the volume integral assures that the ADM mass is a positive quantity if the matter stress-energy tensor, if any, satisfies the dominant energy condition.

---

‡ In the Einstein theory of gravity there is no intrinsic definition of a local energy density due to the equivalence principle. Therefore, one has to define the energy of a system as a global quantity which is defined with respect to background (or asymptotic) space-time.

§ However, the formalism developed in Ref.2 is completely general and can be applied to any type of background space-time.

In curved space-time, the Bogomol'nyi bound for the energy of a soliton can be obtained by embedding the soliton solution into supergravity. Then, the topological charges of soliton configurations (*e.g.*, monopole charges for electromagnetically charged black holes) are identified as central charges of extended supersymmetry algebra. For a given set of Killing spinors, defined as spinor fields which are constant with respect to the supercovariant derivative, one can define a set of conserved anti-commuting supercharges. Supersymmetric variation of the supercharge (or anti-commutation of two supercharges) gives rise to the surface integral whose integrand is a generalized Nester's form (with the spinor now being the parameter of supersymmetry transformation and the gravitational covariant derivative replaced by the supercovariant derivative). The surface integral gives rise to the ADM 4-momentum[2] plus topological charges of the configurations in the form which corresponds to the anti-commutation relation of supercharges in extended supersymmetry. The integrand in the volume integral consists of terms, bilinear in supergravity transformations for the fermionic fields under consideration. This integrand is semi-positive definite provided spinors satisfy the modified Witten's condition, and is zero if and only if supersymmetric variations of all fermionic fields (under consideration) vanish. As in the flat space-time case, the energy of a gravitating system is then bounded from below by the topological charge of the configuration. The solution that saturates the corresponding Bogomol'nyi bound, *i.e.*, the minimum energy configuration for a given topological charge, satisfies the first order differential equations (Killing spinor equations) which are obtained by taking supersymmetric variations of fermionic fields equal to zero. This configuration is a bosonic configuration which is invariant under supersymmetry transformations, and therefore it is called supersymmetric.[¶]

Embedding of black hole (BH) solutions of Maxwell-Einstein gravity into (extended) supergravity was first done in Ref.5, where it was shown that the mass of a BH is bounded from below by its charge.*

[¶] See, for example, Ref.6for a general introduction on supersymmetric solitons.

Another interesting class of BH solutions, which has been subject of intense studies, arises in gravity theories with non-trivial couplings of a scalar field ("the dilaton") to gauge fields. The scalar-Maxwell couplings are common features of unified theories, *e.g.*, Kaluza-Klein theories and superstring theories. The presence of such scalar-Maxwell couplings changes drastically the space-time and thermodynamic properties of the corresponding BH solutions. Electro-magnetically charged solutions with arbitrary dilaton (φ) couplings α to the gauge kinetic term, *i.e.*, $\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$, have been obtained[8] and their properties are shown to depend crucially on the value of the coupling α. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, the extreme charged BH's have zero Hawking temperature and their singularities coincide with the event horizon, *i.e.*, an outside observer cannot observe the singularity. For $\alpha = 1$, it has finite, non-zero temperature and the singularity is still covered with the horizon. However, for $\alpha > 1$, the temperature becomes infinite and the singularity becomes naked, *i.e.*, the outside observer can see it.**

Supersymmetric embedding of charged dilatonic BH's arising in theories with an arbitrary dilaton-Maxwell coupling α is incomplete;*** only for special values of couplings ($\alpha = 1$[10], $\sqrt{3}$[11])[12] the supersymmetric embeddings are known. In fact, $N = 2$ supergravity transformations of gravitino and dilatino fields that would give the correct Bogomol'nyi bounds for dilatonic BH solutions with an arbitrary α were postulated in Ref.13.

---

* Supersymmetric embedding of another type of topological defects, *i.e.*, the domain wall solutions, in $N = 1$ supergravity theory was done in Ref.7. The global space-time structure[7] of domain walls bears remarkable similarities with global space-time of the corresponding supersymmetric charged BH's.

** Recently, it has been observed[9] that supersymmetric (extreme) domain wall solutions in $N = 1$ supergravity with a linear supermultiplet (whose coupling is parameterized by the parameter α) exhibit complementary features; solutions with $\alpha = 1$ separate the solutions with the (planar) naked singularity and infinite temperature ($\alpha < 1$), and those with the horizon and zero temperature ($\alpha > 1$). Note, in this paper α is related to the parameter α of Ref.9 by taking $\alpha \to 1/\sqrt{\alpha}$.

*** A supersymmetric embedding of domain wall solutions with an arbitrary dilaton coupling α to the matter potential was completed in Ref.9. There, it was also shown that the Lagrangian density for dilaton-Maxwell-Einstein system with an arbitrary dilaton-Maxwell coupling α can be obtained from $N = 1$ supergravity theory with a linear supermultiplet, whose coupling is parameterized by α.

On the other hand, compactification of $(4+n)$-dimensional ($(4+n)$-d) gravity down to 4-d, *i.e.*, Kaluza-Klein (KK) theory, could provide a natural way to obtain a 4-d gravity theory with a dilaton-Maxwell coupling α which could in principle depend on the number n of extra dimensions.[****] In order to find the minimum energy configurations in such a class of theories one has to consider embeddings of $(4+n)$-d KK theories into the corresponding supergravity theories (with $5 \leq D \equiv (4+n) \leq 11$), "KK" supergravity theories, which is the topic of our paper. The fact that through such supersymmetric embeddings one might be able to prove the Bogomol'nyi bounds for configurations with a dilaton-Maxwell coupling α different from 1 and $\sqrt{3}$ was one of the motivations for the investigation presented in this paper. However, as it turns out, for supersymmetric embeddings of KK theories the additional scalar fields (the components of the unimodular part of the internal metric) conspire with the dilaton field (the determinant of the internal metric) in such a way that the supersymmetric charged BH solutions of $(4+n)$-d ($n \geq 2$) KK theories are effectively those of 6-d KK theory.

KK compactifications[14] of gravity theory in $(4+n)$-d provide a way of unifying gauge fields and gravity by compactifying the extra dimensions in a higher dimensional pure gravity. In the simplest case, one starts from 5-d gravity and decomposes the metric tensor as

$$g^{(5)}_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} g^{(5)}_{\mu\nu} & g^{(5)}_{\mu 5} \\ g^{(5)}_{5\nu} & \phi \end{pmatrix} \quad . \tag{1.1}$$

One assumes that the fifth dimension is curled up into a very small circle of radius R ($x_5 = x_5 + 2\pi R$, *i.e.*, $M^5 \to M^4 \times S^1$) and, therefore, it is not experimentally measurable. If one further assumes that the metric components are independent of the fifth coordinate, then fields in Eq.(1.1) transform under the general coordinate transformation, $\delta x_A = \Lambda_A(x_\mu)$, as

---

[****] In KK theory the dilaton-Maxwell coupling is given by $e^{\alpha\varphi} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu}$ ($\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{n}}$), provided scalar fields associated with the unimodular part of the internal metric are set to be constant. See, for example, the introduction in the second paper of Ref.8.

$$\delta g^{(5)}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu \Lambda_\nu + \partial_\nu \Lambda_\mu \qquad \delta g^{(5)}_{5\mu} = \partial_\mu \Lambda_5 \qquad\qquad \delta\phi = 0 \ \ . \tag{1.2}$$

One notices that the transformation for $g_{5\mu}$ is precisely the $U(1)$ gauge variation of the Maxwell field A_μ and, thereby, one can identify $g_{\mu 5} = g_{5\mu} = \kappa A_\mu$. Here $\kappa^2 = 8\pi/M^2_{pl}$ is the 4-dimensional gravitational constant. In fact, in this approximation (keeping only zero modes) the original Lagrangian density reduces to the following 4-d one:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa_5^2}\sqrt{-g^{(5)}}\mathcal{R}^{(5)} = \sqrt{-g}\left[-\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\mathcal{R} - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} + ...\right] \quad , \tag{1.3}$$

where $g^{(5)}_{\mu\nu} \equiv g_{\mu\nu} + \kappa^2 A_\mu A_\nu$, $g = \det g_{\mu\nu}$, $\mathcal{R}$ is the Einstein curvature defined in terms of the 4-d metric tensor $g_{\mu\nu}$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ is the $U(1)$ gauge field strength. The 5-dimensional gravitational constant κ_5 is related to the 4-dimensional one κ by $\kappa_5^2 = \kappa^2(2\pi R)$.

This idea was further generalized[15] to unify a set of non-Abelian gauge fields with gravity. Instead of using the zero mode expansion of the metric tensor, one imposes a proper internal isometry[15] of the metric tensor for space-time with dimensionality higher than five.

The effective theory in 4-d which is of the type (1.3) can be generalized[*****] to the case when the components of the unimodular part of the internal metric components, as well as the dilaton, depend on the 4-d space-time coordinates. Components associated with the internal part of a metric tensor act as classical 4-d scalar fields. A class of interesting solutions associated with such an effective 4-d KK theory constitutes configurations with a non-trivial 4-d space-time dependence

---

[*****] See for example Ref.16 and references therein.

for the dilaton, scalar fields, gauge fields, as well as for the 4-d space-time metric. In particular, spherically symmetric charged configurations correspond to charged BH solutions with the dilaton and other scalar fields varying with the spatial radial coordinate. We shall refer to such configurations as charged KK BH's. We would like to address a special class of charged KK BH solutions, namely supersymmetric ones.******

As we have discussed above, such configurations turn out to satisfy the so-called Killing spinor equations, and they saturate the corresponding Bogomol'nyi bounds; within a class of configurations they correspond to the minimum energy configurations and are thus of special interest. The existence of solutions which satisfy the Killing spinor equations implies that the original bosonic theory (in our case $(4+n)$-d pure gravity) can be embedded into the corresponding supersymmetry theory and the minimum energy configurations turn out to be those which preserve some of these supersymmetries. Thus, they are named supersymmetric configurations.

In this paper, we address a class of supersymmetric 4-d charged KK BH solutions, arising in $(4+n)$-d $(1 \leq n \leq 7)$ KK theories. It is an attempt to generalize the work on supersymmetric 4-d BH's in 5-d KK theory, pioneered by Gibbons and Perry.[11] The class of solutions, we are studying, is obtained by choosing the 'minimal', *i.e.*, $N = 1$ or $N = 2$, supersymmetric extension of $(4+n)$-d gravity and by assuming that the only bosonic fields acquiring non-zero classical values, which depend on the 4-d space-time coordinates, are parts of $(4+n)$-d *pure* gravity. Namely, we shall set background values of the other bosonic fields, *i.e.*, $(4+n)$-d gauge fields and anti-symmetric tensors, to zero.******* In addition, we confine our attention to static, spherically symmetric 4-d solutions, only. Generalizations to more general configurations, where some or all of the above assumptions are relaxed are subjects of further investigation.

****** Specific solutions in a broader class, *i.e.*, certain non-supersymmetric configurations, were investigated in Refs.17−21.

******* An example of configurations, where other bosonic degrees of freedom, *i.e.*, $(4+n)$-d gauge fields, are turned on, corresponds to charged supersymmetric 5-d KK BH's studied in Ref.13.

The paper is organized in the following way. In Chapter 2, we spell out the minimal supersymmetric extensions of gravity theories in $(4+n)$-d $(1 \leq n \leq 7)$, the corresponding supersymmetry transformations on gravitino(s) as well as the reality and chirality conditions on spinors in $(4+n)$-d. In Chapter 3, we describe dimensional reduction of bosonic (pure gravity part) and fermionic degrees of freedom in $(4+n)$-d supergravity theories down to 4-d. We also write down the corresponding supersymmetry transformations in terms of the massless degrees of freedom of the 4-d theory. These transformations are the starting point for obtaining Killing spinor equations and the corresponding Bogomol'nyi bound. In Chapter 4, we solve the Killing spinor equations for spherically symmetric charged configurations. The Killing spinor equations can be formally satisfied for any $n \geq 1$. We show that the only consistent solution is the one where only two $U(1)$ isometry factors of the internal isometry group survive, *i.e.*, $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$, that is to say, the supersymmetric BH is dyonic with electric and magnetic charges necessarily associated with *different* $U(1)$ gauge factors. In Section 4.1, we check that the constraints on four-component Killing spinors are compatible with the reality and chirality conditions on spinors in the original $(4+n)$-d supergravities $((4+n) \leq 11)$, and count the remaining independent degrees of freedom for Killing spinors in 4-d. In Section 4.2, we derive the Bogomol'nyi bound for $U(1) \times U(1)$-charged configurations. In Chapter 5, we derive the explicit solutions for supersymmetric 4-d $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$-dyonic KK BH's (and Killing spinors) and discuss their thermal properties and 4-d space-time structure. Conclusions are given in Chapter 6.

2. "Minimal" Supergravity Theories in $(4+n)$ - Dimensions

We shall first summarize properties of the "minimal" supersymmetric extensions of pure gravity theories in $D = 4 + n$ $(1 \leq n \leq 7)$ space-time dimensions ($(4+n)$-d). In particular, we are interested in supersymmetric transformations acting on the gravitino(s), since those are the ones which will yield the corresponding Killing spinor equations for the supersymmetric configurations.

$D = 11$ is believed to be the highest possible dimension[22] for supergravity (SG) theories. The idea being that $D \geq 12$ SG theories compactified down to $D = 4$ yield $N \geq 9$ extended supergravity theories which contain helicity states $\geq \frac{5}{2}$. It has been shown[23] that a spin $\frac{5}{2}$ field cannot be coupled consistently either to gravity or to simple matter systems. Also, for $D \geq 12$ bosonic and fermionic degrees of freedom cannot be matched with the Lorenzian metric signature.[24] Therefore, we will restrict our attention to $D \leq 11$ theories. However, as we shall see in Chapter 4, the solutions satisfying Killing spinor equations, *i.e.*, the solutions of equations $\delta\psi_\Lambda^{A,i} = 0$, can be (formally) obtained for *any* $n \geq 1$.

In our approach we are interested in minimal N extended SG theories, which in $D = 5, 6, 7$ correspond to $N = 2$ and in $D = 8, 9, 10, 11$ to $N = 1$ SG theories. Such higher dimensional supergravity theories have been worked out by various authors; an incomplete list of references includes Refs.25−31. We summarize their properties, relevant to the present work, below.

Supersymmetric extensions of pure gravity theories in $(4+n)$-d do not only involve an addition of the corresponding fermionic degrees of freedom, *i.e.*, at least one gravitino as a gauge field of local supersymmetry that restores the supersymmetry invariance, but also *new bosonic* degrees of freedom, *i.e.*, gauge fields and antisymmetric tensors, which compensate for the mismatch in Bose-Fermi degrees of freedom. Except for the pure gravity part, we will turn off all the bosonic and the fermionic fields, *i.e.*, except for the gravity part we set classical values associated with all the other bosonic fields to zero. Thus, the bosonic part of the Lagrangian density is of the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa^2}\sqrt{-g^{(4+n)}}\mathcal{R}^{(4+n)} \quad , \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mathcal{R}^{(4+n)}$ is the Ricci scalar defined in terms of a $(4+n)$-dimensional metric $g_{MN}^{(4+n)}$ and κ is the $(n+4)$-dimensional gravitational coupling constant.

In the case when all the other bosonic degrees of freedom except those of pure $(4+n)$-d gravity are turned off, the gravitino(s) transforms under supersymmetry as

$$\delta\psi_\Lambda^{\mathbf{A},i} = D_\Lambda \varepsilon^{\mathbf{A},i} = (\partial_\Lambda + \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\Lambda AB}\Gamma^{AB})\varepsilon^{\mathbf{A},i} \quad , \tag{2.2}$$

where $\mathbf{A} = 1, ..., 2^{[\frac{n+4}{2}]}$ is the index for $(4+n)$-dimensional spinors and $i = 1, ..., N$ labels spinors (supersymmetry parameters or gravitinos) of N-extended supergravity. As usual, $\Gamma^{AB} \equiv \Gamma^{[A}\Gamma^{B]}$, where Γ^A's are gamma matrices satisfying the $SO(3+n,1)$-Clifford algebra. The spin-connection is defined in terms of a Vielbein E_Λ^A: $\Omega_{ABC} \equiv -\tilde{\Omega}_{AB,C} + \tilde{\Omega}_{BC,A} - \tilde{\Omega}_{CA,B}$ where $\tilde{\Omega}_{AB,C} \equiv E_{[A}^\Lambda E_{B]}^\Pi \partial_\Pi E_{\Lambda C}$. Notation $[A \ ... \ B]$ refers to antisymmetrization of the corresponding indices.

The nature of the corresponding spinor(s) $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{A},i}$ in (2.2) differs in each dimension of SG theories. It depends on the Clifford algebra satisfied by gamma matrices for each dimension[32]. $N = 1$ extensions of $(4+n)$-dimensional Poincaré gravity exist if Majorana spinors exist and the matrix $\mathcal{C}\gamma^a$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a charge conjugation matrix defined below (Eqs.(2.6)−(2.8)), is symmetric. These can be satisfied in $D = 4, 8, 9, 10, 11$. In the other dimensions, where the above conditions do not hold, one has to introduce extended supersymmetries, $N = 2$ being minimal, and spinors satisfy alternative reality conditions, *e.g.*, $SU(2)$ or $USp(2)$ (pseudo-) Majorana conditions. Properties of spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{A},i}$ in (2.2) for the minimal extended SG's are as follows.

For $D = 5$, we have two $(i = 1, 2)$ symplectic $(USp(2))$ four-component ($\mathbf{A}$= $1, ..., 4$) spinors[⋆] defined in terms of four dimensional two-component ($\mathbf{a} = 1, 2$)

[⋆] See for example Ref.25.

Weyl spinors (ε^i_W):

$$(\varepsilon^i) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon^{i\mathbf{a}}_W \\ \Omega^i_j \overline{\varepsilon}^j_{W\,\mathbf{a}} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \tag{2.3}$$

where $\overline{\varepsilon}^i_{W\,\mathbf{a}} = -(\sigma^2)^{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathbf{a}} \varepsilon^{*i}_{W\,\mathbf{b}}$ and Ω is a (2×2) symplectic invariant matrix, *i.e.*, $\Omega = i\sigma^2$. Here, σ^2 is the second Pauli matrix.

For $D = 6$, we have two ($i = 1, 2$) symplectic ($USp(2)$) eight-component ($\mathbf{A}= 1, ..., 8$) Majorana spinors, related to each other in the following way:

$$(\varepsilon^i)^* = \Omega^i_j \mathcal{B} \varepsilon^j \quad , \tag{2.4}$$

where $\Omega = i\sigma^2$ is an antisymmetric real metric of $USp(2)$ and an invertible matrix $\mathcal{B}$, acting on the index $\mathbf{A}$ of each spinor, is defined as $\Gamma^\mu = -\mathcal{B}^{-1}\Gamma^{\mu *}\mathcal{B}$ with $\mathcal{B}^*\mathcal{B} = -1$.

For $D = 7$, two ($i = 1, 2$) $SU(2)$ eight-component ($\mathbf{A}= 1, ..., 8$) Majorana spinors are defined as

$$(\varepsilon^i)^* = \varepsilon^i_j \mathcal{B} \varepsilon^j \quad , \tag{2.5}$$

where ε^i_j is an $SU(2)$ invariant antisymmetric tensor and $\mathcal{B}$ is defined analogously as above.

For $D = 8, 9$, there is one 16-component ($\mathbf{A} = 1, ..., 16$) pseudo-Majorana spinor satisfying

$$\overline{\varepsilon} \equiv \varepsilon^\dagger \Gamma_0 = \varepsilon^T \mathcal{C} \quad , \tag{2.6}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the charge conjugation matrix satisfying $\mathcal{C}\Gamma_\mu\mathcal{C}^{-1} = +\Gamma^T_\mu$.

For $D = 10$, there is one 32-component Majorana-Weyl spinor satisfying

$$\overline{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^T \mathcal{C} \qquad \Gamma_{11}\varepsilon = \varepsilon \tag{2.7}$$

with $\mathcal{C}\Gamma_\mu\mathcal{C}^{-1} = -\Gamma^T_\mu$.

For $D = 11$, there is one 32-component Majorana spinor satisfying

$$\bar{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon^T \mathcal{C} \quad , \tag{2.8}$$

where $\mathcal{C}\Gamma_\mu \mathcal{C}^{-1} = -\Gamma_\mu^T$.

3. Supersymmetric Kaluza-Klein Compactification

The effective Kaluza-Klein (KK) theory in 4-d is obtained from $(4+n)$-d pure gravity by compactifying the extra n spatial coordinates on a compact manifold. Before addressing the compactification Ansätze we spell out our notation. General indices running over $(4+n)$-d are denoted by upper-case letters $(A, B, ..., \Lambda, \Pi, ...)$. Lower-case letters $(a, b, ..., \lambda, \pi, ...)$ denote indices running over the 4 space-time dimensions and lower-case letters with tilde $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, ..., \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\pi}, ...)$ are for the n extra spatial dimensions. Latin letters $(A, B, ..., a, b, ...)$ denote flat-tangent space-time indices, and Greek letters $(\Lambda, \Pi, ..., \lambda, \pi, ...)$ are reserved for curved space-time indices. Note also that the 4-d space-time coordinates $(t, \phi, r, ...)$ as variables are understood as curved. The flat Lorenz metric of tangent space is chosen to be $(+ - - \cdots -)$ with the internal coordinates all space-like.

Compactified theories in 4-d with the most general KK Ansätze are obtained[16] by imposing the invariance of a $(4+n)$-d metric under an isometry of the internal space. The KK Ansätze for the Vielbein $E_\Lambda^{(4+n)A}$ and the corresponding metric $g_{\Lambda\Pi}^{(4+n)}$ are of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} E_\Lambda^{(4+n)A} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\varphi} \mathrm{e}_\lambda^a & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{n\alpha}\varphi} A_\lambda^{\tilde{\lambda}} \Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}}^{\tilde{a}} \\ 0 & \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{n\alpha}\varphi} \Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}}^{\tilde{a}} \end{bmatrix} \\ g_{\Lambda\Pi}^{(4+n)} &= \eta_{AB} E_\Lambda^{(4+n)A} E_\Pi^{(4+n)B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}\varphi} g_{\lambda\pi} - \mathrm{e}^{\frac{2\varphi}{n\alpha}} \rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}} A_\lambda^{\tilde{\lambda}} A_\pi^{\tilde{\pi}} & -\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2\varphi}{n\alpha}} \rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}} A_\lambda^{\tilde{\lambda}} \\ -\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2\varphi}{n\alpha}} \rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}} A_\pi^{\tilde{\pi}} & -\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2\varphi}{n\alpha}} \rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}} \end{bmatrix} \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}} \equiv \Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}}^{\tilde{a}} \Phi_{\tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{a}}$ satisfies $\det \rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}} = 1$, *i.e.*, $\rho_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}}$ is the unimodular part of the internal metric $g_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\pi}}$, and $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{n}}$.

The effective 4-d Lagrangian density can then be written in terms of the above Ansätze, whose components depend on the internal space coordinates as well. One imposes "the right invariance" of the $(4+n)$-d metric $g_{\Lambda\Pi}$ under the action of an isometry of the internal space:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\tilde\alpha}} g_{\Lambda\Pi} = 0 \quad , \qquad [\xi_{\tilde\alpha}, \xi_{\tilde\beta}] = f^{\tilde\gamma}_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta}\xi_{\tilde\gamma} \quad , \tag{3.2}$$

where $\xi_{\tilde\alpha}$'s are n linearly independent Killing vectors of the internal space and $\mathcal{L}_{\xi_{\tilde\alpha}}$ is the Lie derivative in the direction of a vector $\xi_{\tilde\alpha}$. The above constraints determine the following dependence of the metric components on the internal coordinates:

$$\partial_{\tilde\alpha} g_{\mu\nu} = 0 \qquad \partial_{\tilde\alpha} A^{\tilde\gamma}_{\mu} = -f^{\tilde\gamma}_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta} A^{\tilde\beta}_{\mu} \qquad \partial_{\tilde\alpha}\rho_{\tilde\beta\tilde\gamma} = f^{\tilde\delta}_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta}\rho_{\tilde\delta\tilde\gamma} + f^{\tilde\delta}_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\gamma}\rho_{\tilde\beta\tilde\delta} \quad . \tag{3.3}$$

Additionally, if the isometry of the internal space is unimodular, then the $(4+n)$-d Einstein Lagrangian density (2.1) becomes independent of the internal coordinates and after a trivial integration over the internal coordinates the 4-d Lagrangian density is, after setting the 4-d gravitational constant κ_4 equal to 1, of the following form (see for example Eq.(8) of Ref.16):

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-g}[\mathcal{R} + \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varphi}\mathcal{R}_K + \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta}F^{\tilde\alpha}_{\mu\nu}F^{\tilde\beta\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\varphi\partial^\mu\varphi \\ -\frac{1}{4}\rho^{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta}\rho^{\tilde\gamma\tilde\delta}(D_\mu\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\gamma})(D^\mu\rho_{\tilde\beta\tilde\delta}) + \lambda(\det\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta} - 1)] \quad ,\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_K$ is the Ricci scalar* defined in terms of the unimodular part $\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta}$ of the internal metric, $F^{\tilde\alpha}_{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial_\mu A^{\tilde\alpha}_\nu - \partial_\nu A^{\tilde\alpha}_\mu - g f^{\tilde\alpha}_{\tilde\beta\tilde\gamma} A^{\tilde\beta}_\mu A^{\tilde\gamma}_\nu$, where $f^{\tilde\alpha}_{\tilde\beta\tilde\gamma}$ is the structure constant for the internal isometry group and g is the gauge coupling constant of the isometry group, is the field strength of the gauge field $A^{\tilde\alpha}_\mu$, $D_\mu\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta} = \partial_\mu\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta} - f^{\tilde\delta}_{\tilde\gamma\tilde\beta}A^{\tilde\gamma}_\mu\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\delta}$ is the corresponding gauge covariant derivative and λ is the Lagrangian multiplier. Note that $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{n}}$ specifies the coupling constant of the dilaton φ to the gauge fields in the gauge field kinetic energy terms,*i.e.*, $\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_{\tilde\alpha\tilde\beta}F^{\tilde\alpha}_{\mu\nu}F^{\tilde\beta\mu\nu}$.

$\star$ This term describes the self-interactions among scalar fields and vanishes for an Abelian isometry group, *i.e.*, if the internal space is an n-torus.

With the metric Ansatz (3.1), we would like to find a specific class of 4-d configurations which satisfy the Killing spinor equations, *i.e.*, those for which the gravitino transformation(s) (2.2) vanishes. Given the metric Ansatz (3.1), whose components depend on the 4-d space-time coordinates as well as the internal coordinates, one can re-express the bosonic quantities in the gravitino transformation(s) (2.2) in terms of 4-d quantities.

The next task, however, is to decompose the $2^{[\frac{n+4}{2}]}$-component spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{A},i}$ in (2.2) ($\mathbf{A} = 1, ..., 2^{[\frac{n+4}{2}]}$, $i = 1, 2$), as defined in $(n+4)$-d, in terms of 4-component spinors in 4-d. The dimensional reduction[33] of such spinors can be accomplished by reducing the spinor with respect to a continuous symmetry group of the compact internal space. A $(4+n)$-dimensional spinor index $\mathbf{A}$ is split into $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{m})$ where $\mathbf{a} = 1, ..., 4$ and $\mathbf{m} = 1, ..., 2^{[\frac{n}{2}]}$. A $(4+n)$-d spinor then decomposes as $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{A}} \equiv \varepsilon^{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{m})}$, thus corresponding to $2^{[\frac{n}{2}]}$ copies of 4-component spinors in $D = 4$. Note, that such a decomposition is valid for each spinor, *i.e.*, $i = 1, 2$.

For $(4 + n)$-d gamma matrices Γ^A, which satisfy the $SO(3 + n, 1)$ Clifford algebra $\{\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B\} = 2\eta^{AB}$, one can always find a representation[16,33] in which

$$\Gamma^a = \gamma^a \otimes I \qquad\qquad \Gamma^{\tilde a} = \gamma^5 \otimes \gamma^{\tilde a} \quad , \tag{3.5}$$

where $\{\gamma^a, \gamma^b\} = 2\eta^{ab}$, $\{\gamma^{\tilde a}, \gamma^{\tilde b}\} = -2\delta^{\tilde a\tilde b}$, I is the $(2^{[\frac{n}{2}]} \times 2^{[\frac{n}{2}]})$ identity matrix and $\gamma^5 \equiv i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3$. $(\gamma^a)^{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathbf{b}}$ acts on the index $\mathbf{a}$ and $(\gamma^{\tilde a})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}$ acts on the index $\mathbf{m}$ of the spinor $\varepsilon^{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{m})}$. Γ^{AB} can be expressed in terms of γ's by applying the definition of tensor product of matrices: $[A \otimes B]^{(\mathbf{a},\mathbf{m})}_{(\mathbf{b},\mathbf{n})} \equiv A^{\mathbf{a}}_{\mathbf{b}} B^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}$. In the following we shall suppress the indices $\mathbf{a} = 1, ..., 4$ (denoting components of a four-component spinor) and keep only the indices $\mathbf{m} = 1, ..., 2^{[\frac{n}{2}]}$ (denoting the $\mathbf{m}^{th}$ four-component spinor).

With the above conventions and the assumption that the four-component spinors depend on the 4-d space-time coordinates,† the gravitino transformation(s)

---

† The right invariance requires spinors to be independent of the internal coordinate.[16]

(2.2) reduces to the following forms:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\psi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mu} &= \partial_{\mu}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}} + \frac{1}{4}\{\omega_{\mu ab} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mathrm{e}^{c}_{\mu}\eta_{c[a}\mathrm{e}^{\nu}_{b]}\partial_{\nu}\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\lambda}}A^{\tilde{\mu}}_{\mu}F^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{ab}\}(\gamma^{ab})\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\sum_{\tilde{b}}\{\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}^{c}_{\mu}\Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{b}}F^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{ca} - \frac{1}{n\alpha}\Phi_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{b}}A^{\tilde{\mu}}_{\mu}\partial_{a}\varphi - \frac{1}{2}A^{\tilde{\mu}}_{\mu}D_{a}\Phi_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{b}} - \frac{1}{2}A^{\tilde{\mu}}_{\mu}\Phi^{\tilde{c}}_{\tilde{\mu}}\Phi^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{\tilde{b}}D_{a}\Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{c}}\}(\gamma^{a5})\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{b}} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(\Phi^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{\tilde{a}}D_{\mu}\Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{b}} - \Phi^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{\tilde{b}}D_{\mu}\Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{a}})\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta\psi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{\mu}} &= \frac{1}{8}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\lambda}}F^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{ab}(\gamma^{ab})\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}} - \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\{\frac{1}{n\alpha}\Phi_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{b}}\partial_{a}\varphi + \frac{1}{2}(D_{a}\Phi_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{b}} + \Phi^{\tilde{c}}_{\tilde{\mu}}\Phi^{\tilde{\lambda}}_{\tilde{b}}D_{a}\Phi_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{c}})\}(\gamma^{a5})\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{b}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2}(f^{\tilde{\alpha}}_{\tilde{\beta}\tilde{\gamma}}\rho_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\mu}}\Phi^{\tilde{\beta}}_{\tilde{a}}\Phi^{\tilde{\gamma}}_{\tilde{b}} - f^{\tilde{\alpha}}_{\tilde{\beta}\tilde{\mu}}\Phi^{\tilde{\beta}}_{\tilde{a}}\Phi_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{b}} + f^{\tilde{\alpha}}_{\tilde{\beta}\tilde{\mu}}\Phi^{\tilde{\beta}}_{\tilde{b}}\Phi_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{a}})\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}} \quad ,\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$, $(a, b) = 0, 1, 2, 3$, $\tilde{\mu} = 4, 5, ..., (3 + n)$, and $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}) = 4, 5, ..., (3 + n)$. The spinors with tilde are defined as $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{b}} \equiv (\gamma^{\tilde{b}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{n}}$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}} \equiv (\gamma^{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{n}}$, $\Phi^{\tilde{\pi}}_{\tilde{a}} = (\Phi^{-1})^{\tilde{a}}_{\tilde{\pi}}$ and the index $\tilde{a}$ in $\Phi^{\tilde{a}}_{\tilde{\mu}}$ is lowered by $\eta_{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}$. Recall, $\gamma^{ab} \equiv \gamma^{[a}\gamma^{b]}$, with $[a \; ... \; b]$ denoting antisymmetrization of the corresponding indices.

We would like to point out that the above formal de-composition of the bosonic and the fermionic degrees of freedom and the corresponding supersymmetry transformations (3.6) and (3.7) can be done for *any* space-time dimensions $D = 4 + n$.

4. Features of Abelian Supersymmetric Solutions

We will confine the analysis of supersymmetric solutions to the case of Abelian compactifications, only. In this case we would like to show that 4-d supersymmetric configurations, which are charged, static and spherically symmetric, exist if and only if the vacuum configurations break an Abelian isometry group G of the internal space down to $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$, *i.e.*, such configurations correspond to 4-d dyonic black holes (BH's) whose electric and magnetic charges are necessarily associated with different $U(1)$ gauge factors. This constraint arises from the fact that the Killing spinor equations arising from (3.6) and (3.7) impose consistent constraints on the phases of spinors only when the internal isometry group is broken down to the $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$ group. Namely, we shall see that if there are more than one massless gauge fields of the same type (electric or magnetic) or any one of gauge fields has both electric and magnetic charges, then one is not able to satisfy the Killing spinor equations and thus such solutions are not supersymmetric. We suspect that supersymmetric vacuum solutions may break perhaps *any* isometry group G down to $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$, however, we show this explicitly in the case for an Abelian isometry group, only. We shall also show that the constraints on four component spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}$ are consistent with reality and chirality conditions on the original Dirac spinors of the underlying $(4+n)$-d supergravities as discussed at the end of Chapter 2. And we shall drive the Bogomol'nyi bound for $U(1) \times U(1)$-charged black hole configurations.

If the isometry group G of the internal space is Abelian, *i.e.*, $U(1)^n$, then the vacuum configurations correspond to flat internal space. The structure constant vanishes, *i.e.*, $f^{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, and the metric components $g_{\Lambda\Pi}$ are *independent* of the internal coordinates (see Eq.(3.3)). With a proper choice of gauge, the internal metric $\rho_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}}$ (see Eq.(3.1)) can be diagonalized:

$$\rho_{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\beta}} = \mathrm{diag}(\rho_1, ..., \ \rho_{n-1}, \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \rho_k^{-1}) \quad . \tag{4.1}$$

So, indices $\tilde{a}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}$ of the fields in equations (3.6) and (3.7) take the same values, and therefore for simplicity of notation we shall just replace the curved index $\tilde{\alpha}$ in the gauge fields by the flat index $\tilde{a}$. The 4-d space-time metric is chosen to be of the following spherically symmetric form:

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu = \lambda(r) dt^2 - \lambda^{-1}(r) dr^2 - R(r)(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2) \tag{4.2}$$

and the internal metric modes φ and $\rho_{1,...,(n-1)}$ are functions of the radial coordinate r, only.

Given the spherical Ansatz for the metric, the orthonormal tangent frame is defined with Vierbein components of the following form:

$$\mathrm{e}_t^{\hat{t}} = \lambda^{1/2} \qquad \mathrm{e}_\theta^{\hat{\theta}} = R^{1/2} \qquad \mathrm{e}_\phi^{\hat{\phi}} = R^{1/2}\sin\theta \qquad \mathrm{e}_r^{\hat{r}} = \lambda^{-1/2} \quad , \tag{4.3}$$

which yield the metric $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{ab}\mathrm{e}_\mu^a \mathrm{e}_\nu^b$ defined in Eq.(4.2). Here $\eta_{ab} = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1,-1,-1)$, where $a, b = \hat{t}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}, \hat{r}$ correspond to the tangent (flat) space indices, and the flat space gamma matrices $\gamma^{0,1,2,3}$ are ordered in the same manner, *i.e.*, $\gamma^{\hat{t}} = \gamma^0, ..., \gamma^{\hat{r}} = \gamma^3$.

The Ansätze for electric and magnetic fields, compatible with spherical symmetry, are of the following form:

$$F_{tr}^{\tilde{a}} = E^{\tilde{a}}(r) \quad , \qquad F_{\theta\phi}^{\tilde{a}} = P^{\tilde{a}}\sin\theta \quad , \quad \tilde{a} = 4, ..., (n+3) \quad , \tag{4.4}$$

where $E^{\tilde{a}}(r) = \frac{\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}}{R\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_i}$ $(i \equiv \tilde{a} - 3 = 1, ..., n)$ is obtained from the Gauss's law by using the Maxwell equations $\nabla_\mu(\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_i F^{\tilde{a}\mu\nu}) = 0$ $(i \equiv \tilde{a} - 3 = 1, ..., n)$ derived from the Lagrangian density (3.4). $P^{\tilde{a}}$ is the physical magnetic monopole charge and the constant $\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}$ is related to the physical electric charge[⋆] $Q^{\tilde{a}}$ of the configuration in the following way: $Q^{\tilde{a}} = \mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varphi_\infty}\rho_{i\infty}^{-1}\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}$. Here the subscript ∞ denotes the asymptotic values of fields at infinity.

With the above Ansätze the Killing spinor equations, which are obtained by setting (3.7) equal to zero, can be cast in the following form:

$$\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}R^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varphi}\rho_i^{-1}\gamma^{03}\varepsilon + P^{\tilde{a}}R^{-1}\gamma^{12}\varepsilon + 2\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{1}{n\alpha}\partial_r\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\rho_i^{-1}\partial_r\rho_i)(\gamma^{35}\otimes\gamma^{\tilde{a}})\varepsilon = 0 \quad , \tag{4.5}$$

where $i = \tilde{a} - 3 = 1, ..., n$. Recall $\rho_n = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}\rho_k^{-1}$ and $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{n}}$. The n equations in (4.5) impose the following n constraints between the lower two-component

---

[⋆] We define the physical electric charge Q as $E \sim \frac{Q}{r^2}$ in the limit $r \to \infty$.

spinors $\varepsilon_\ell^{\mathbf{m}}$ and the upper two-component spinors $\varepsilon_u^{\mathbf{m}}$ ($(\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}})^T \equiv (\varepsilon_u^{\mathbf{m}}, \varepsilon_\ell^{\mathbf{m}})^T$)):

$$(\gamma^{\tilde{a}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}\ \varepsilon_\ell^{\mathbf{n}} = \eta_{\tilde{a}} \mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}(r)} \varepsilon_u^{\mathbf{m}}\ ; \quad \eta_{\tilde{a}} = \pm 1 \tag{4.6}$$

for each $\tilde{a}$ ($\tilde{a} = 4, ..., (n+3)$) for which there are non-zero $\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}$ and (or) $P^{\tilde{a}}$. The phase $\theta_{\tilde{a}}$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}(r)} \equiv \left[(\frac{\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}}{\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_i} - iP^{\tilde{a}})/(\frac{\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}}{\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_i} + iP^{\tilde{a}}) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad . \tag{4.7}$$

Note that any two constraints of the type (4.6) are compatible as long as the corresponding phase difference satisfies:

$$\theta_{\tilde{a}} - \theta_{\tilde{b}} = \pm\frac{\pi}{2} \quad , \tilde{a} \neq \tilde{b}. \tag{4.8}$$

Namely, $\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\varepsilon_\ell = \eta_{\tilde{a}}\mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}}\varepsilon_u$ and $\gamma^{\tilde{b}}\varepsilon_\ell = \eta_{\tilde{b}}\mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{b}}}\varepsilon_u$ imply $\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\gamma^{\tilde{b}}\varepsilon_\ell = \eta_{\tilde{a}}\eta_{\tilde{b}}\mathrm{e}^{i(\theta_{\tilde{a}}-\theta_{\tilde{b}})}\varepsilon_\ell$. Since $(\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\gamma^{\tilde{b}})^2 = -1$, the constraint $\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\gamma^{\tilde{b}}\varepsilon_\ell = \eta_{\tilde{a}}\eta_{\tilde{b}}\mathrm{e}^{i(\theta_{\tilde{a}}-\theta_{\tilde{b}})}\varepsilon_\ell$ has a non-zero solution for ε_ℓ if and only if $\eta_{\tilde{a}}\eta_{\tilde{b}}\mathrm{e}^{i(\theta_{\tilde{a}}-\theta_{\tilde{b}})} = \pm i$ and thus Eq.(4.8) has to be satisfied. Note, the condition (4.8) can be satisfied for *two* $U(1)$ gauge factors, only. Namely, with more than two $U(1)$ gauge factors one has $\theta_{\tilde{a}} - \theta_{\tilde{b}} = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ ($\tilde{a} \neq \tilde{b}$) and $\theta_{\tilde{b}} - \theta_{\tilde{c}} = \pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ ($\tilde{b} \neq \tilde{c}$), which in turn imply $\theta_{\tilde{a}} - \theta_{\tilde{c}} = 0, \pm\pi$ ($\tilde{a} \neq \tilde{c}$). The latter constraint is thus inconsistent with Eq.(4.8). *Therefore, by considering Killing spinor equations, arising by setting* (3.7) *to zero, the allowed supersymmetric vacua in 4-d are those with* $U(1) \times U(1)$ *internal isometry groups.* Without loss of generality, in further discussion we choose two $U(1)$ factors to be associated with the $(n-1)^{th}$ and the n^{th} internal dimensions, *i.e.*, $\tilde{a} = n+2,\ n+3$.

We would now like to show, using the Killing spinor equations obtained by setting (3.6) to zero, that the supersymmetric solution corresponds to dyonic BH's with electric and magnetic charges necessarily associated with different $U(1)$ factors. Using the Ansätze for the dilaton $\varphi(r)$, the internal metric (Eq.(4.1)), the

4-d metric (Eq.(4.2)), and the gauge fields (Eq.(4.4)) as well as the constraint that the Killing spinors are independent of t, the Killing spinor equations arising from Eq.(3.6) are of the following form:

$$(\lambda' - \frac{1}{\alpha}\lambda\partial_r\varphi)\gamma^{03}\varepsilon - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}R^{-1}\sum_{\tilde{a}=n+2}^{n+3}\rho_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}(\gamma^{35}\otimes\gamma^{\tilde{a}})\varepsilon = 0 \tag{4.9}$$

$$\partial_\theta\varepsilon - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda R}(\frac{R'}{R} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r\varphi)\gamma^{13}\varepsilon - \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}R^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{\tilde{a}=n+2}^{n+3}\rho_i^{\frac{1}{2}}P^{\tilde{a}}(\gamma^{25}\otimes\gamma^{\tilde{a}})\varepsilon = 0 \tag{4.10}$$

$$\partial_\phi\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2}\cos\theta\gamma^{21}\varepsilon - \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\lambda R}\sin\theta(\frac{R'}{R} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r\varphi)\gamma^{23}\varepsilon + \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}R^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{\tilde{a}=n+2}^{n+3}\rho_i^{\frac{1}{2}}P^{\tilde{a}}\sin\theta(\gamma^{15}\otimes\gamma^{\tilde{a}})\varepsilon = 0 \tag{4.11}$$

$$\partial_r\varepsilon + \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}R^{-1}\sum_{\tilde{a}=n+2}^{n+3}\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}\rho_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\gamma^{05}\otimes\gamma^{\tilde{a}})\varepsilon = 0 \quad , \tag{4.12}$$

Eq.(4.9) along with the spinor constraint (4.6) gives rise to the following first order differential equation:

$$(\lambda' - \frac{1}{\alpha}\lambda\partial_r\varphi) - \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}R^{-1}\sum_{\tilde{a}=n+2}^{n+3}\eta_{\tilde{a}}\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}\mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}(r)}\rho_i^{-\frac{1}{2}} = 0 \quad . \tag{4.13}$$

The above constraint can be satisfied with one, say, the $\tilde{a}^{th} = (n+3)^{th}$, gauge field $A_\mu^{\tilde{a}}$ having non-zero electric charge[⋆] ($\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}} \neq 0$), but its magnetic charge being necessarily zero ($P^{\tilde{a}} = 0$). Namely, if the field $A_\mu^{\tilde{a}}$ has $P^{\tilde{a}} \neq 0$ as well, the phase term $\mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}}$ would be complex (see Eq.(4.7)), and then Eq.(4.13) could not be satisfied with non-zero $\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}}$. Similarly, a linear combination of equations (4.10) and (4.11)

[⋆] Note that both gauge fields A_μ^{n+2} and A_μ^{n+3} cannot have non-zero electric (or magnetic) charges, because in this case the phases $\mathrm{e}^{\theta_{(n+2,n+3)}(r)} = \pm 1(\text{or}\pm i)$, as determined by Eq.(4.7), are incompatible with Eq.(4.8).

(after making use of Eq.(5.3), which we will derive later) along with (4.6) yields the following differential equation:

$$2 = \sqrt{\lambda} R(\frac{R'}{R} - \frac{2}{\alpha}\partial_r\varphi) + i\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi} R^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\tilde{a}=n+2}^{n+3} \eta_{\tilde{a}} P^{\tilde{a}} \mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}(r)} \rho_i^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad . \tag{4.14}$$

Say, if the $\tilde{a}^{th} = (n+2)^{th}$ gauge field $A_\mu^{\tilde{a}}$ has non-zero magnetic charge $P^{\tilde{a}} \neq 0$, then $A_\mu^{\tilde{a}}$ should have *no* electric charge ($\tilde{Q}^{\tilde{a}} = 0$). Namely, in order to satisfy Eq.(4.14) the phase $\mathrm{e}^{i\theta_{\tilde{a}}(r)}$ (determined by Eq.(4.7)) has to be purely imaginary, and thus it should contain *no* electric charge. In addition, the phase difference associated with each $U(1)$ gauge factor has to be $\pm\frac{\pi}{2}$ (see Eq.(4.8)). Thus, if one gauge field is purely electric, the other one necessarily has to be purely magnetic. Furthermore, it can be shown that an alternative case where all the magnetic and electric charges are non-zero and are chosen so that (4.13) and (4.14) are satisfied is not consistent with (4.8).

Therefore, supersymmetric spherical solutions choose the vacuum where the isometry group of the internal space is broken down to $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$. These configurations are dyonic with electric and magnetic charges associated with *different* $U(1)$ factors. Recall, the corresponding constraints between the upper and the lower components of 4-d spinors are then of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{say, } \tilde{a}^{th} = (n+2)^{th} \text{ gauge field purely magnetic } (\tilde{Q}^{n+2} = 0) : \quad \gamma^{n+2}\varepsilon_\ell = i\eta_m\varepsilon_u \\ &\text{say, } \tilde{a}^{th} = (n+3)^{th} \text{ gauge field purely electric } (\tilde{P}^{n+3} = 0) \quad : \quad \gamma^{n+3}\varepsilon_\ell = \eta_e\varepsilon_u \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Here, $\eta_{e,m} = \pm 1$.

In the following Section, we shall explicitly check that the constraints (4.15) are consistent with the conditions (2.3) − (2.8), which are satisfied by the original spinors in D-dimensional supergravity (SG).

4.1. COMPATIBILITY OF 4-D SPINOR CONSTRAINTS WITH REALITY AND CHIRALITY CONDITIONS ON $(4+n)$-D SPINORS

In this Section, we shall show that reality and chirality conditions on Dirac spinors in each dimension $5 \leq D \leq 11$ are compatible with the spinor constraints (4.15) that we have obtained from the Killing spinor equations, thereby, proving the existence of Killing spinors for our BH configurations.

For $D = 5$, two spinors are related through the $USp(2)$-condition (see Eq.(2.3)). Each component of spinors in equations (2.3) and (4.15) is related by

$$\varepsilon_u^{\mathbf{m}=i} = \varepsilon_W^i \qquad \varepsilon_\ell^1 = \overline{\varepsilon}_W^2 \qquad \varepsilon_\ell^2 = -\overline{\varepsilon}_W^1 \quad . \tag{4.16}$$

With the explicit representation $\gamma^{\tilde{4}} = i$, one can see that the spinor constraints (4.15) can be satisfied by a non-zero ε.

For $D = 6, 7$, two spinors with each having eight independent components are restricted by the reality conditions (2.4) and (2.5). Without loss of generality, let's consider the case with $i = 1$. Since all the eight components of the two 4-component spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}=1}$ and $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}=2}$, obtained from dimensional reduction of the 8-component spinor $\varepsilon^{i=1}$, are independent the constraints (4.15) can be satisfied. Then, it remains to show that the second spinor $\varepsilon^{i=2} = \mathcal{B}^{-1}(\varepsilon^{i=1})^*$ is a Killing spinor as well. Since $\varepsilon^{i=1}$ is a Killing spinor it satisfies:

$$\hat{\nabla}_\Pi \varepsilon^{i=1} = (\partial_\Pi + \frac{1}{4}\Omega_{\Pi AB}\Gamma^{AB})\varepsilon^{i=1} = 0 \quad . \tag{4.17}$$

Now we perform complex conjugation of Eq.(4.17). After making use of the definition of $\mathcal{B}$, $\Gamma^{\mu *}\mathcal{B} = -\mathcal{B}\Gamma^\mu$ (to turn $\Gamma^{\mu *}$ into Γ^μ and pull out the matrix $\mathcal{B}$ to the left) and the fact that the matrix $\mathcal{B}$ is invertible, we obtain the Killing spinor equation (4.17) for $\varepsilon^{i=2}$ as well.

For $D = 8, ..., 11$, we have one Dirac spinor constrained by a reality (and chirality) condition(s). One may re-express the spinor constraints (4.15) in terms of $(4+n)$-dimensional quantities:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Gamma^{\tilde{a}}\varepsilon = \eta_e \Gamma^0 \varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad \varepsilon = \eta_e \Gamma^0 \Gamma^{\tilde{a}} \varepsilon \quad \text{for electric field, say, } \tilde{a} = (n+3) \\
&\Gamma^{\tilde{b}}\varepsilon = i\eta_m \Gamma^5 \Gamma^0 \varepsilon \quad \text{or} \quad \varepsilon = i\eta_m \Gamma^0 \Gamma^5 \Gamma^{\tilde{b}} \varepsilon \quad \text{for magnetic field, say, } \tilde{b} = (n+2) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

where $\Gamma^5 \equiv i\Gamma^0\Gamma^1\Gamma^2\Gamma^3$ and $\tilde{a} \neq \tilde{b}$. There exists a basis in which all the Γ matrices and the spinors are real. In this basis, the (pseudo-) Majorana conditions (2.6) − (2.8) can be written as

$$\varepsilon = \mathcal{C}\Gamma^0\varepsilon \ . \tag{4.19}$$

In $D = 10$, spinors are Majorana-Weyl and thus there is additionally chirality condition:

$$\Gamma^{11}\varepsilon = \varepsilon \ . \tag{4.20}$$

Eqs.(4.18)−(4.20) are simultaneous eigen-value equations that must be satisfied by a non-zero ε. It can be shown that the matrices $\eta_e\Gamma^0\Gamma^{\tilde{a}}$, $i\eta_m\Gamma^0\Gamma^5\Gamma^{\tilde{a}}$, $\mathcal{C}\Gamma^0$ and Γ^{11} commute among themselves, by using the following properties of the charge conjugation matrix $\mathcal{C}$:

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^T = \mathcal{C}^* \qquad\qquad \mathcal{C}\Gamma_\Pi = \pm\Gamma_\Pi^T\mathcal{C} \ , \tag{4.21}$$

the Clifford algebra $\{\Gamma^A, \Gamma^B\} = 2\eta^{AB}$ and the following hermicity property of gamma matrices:

$$\Gamma_0^\dagger = \Gamma_0 \qquad\qquad \Gamma_A^\dagger = -\Gamma_A \ , \ A \neq 0 \ . \tag{4.22}$$

Therefore, there exists an eigen-vector ε which is a simultaneous solution of equations (4.18) through (4.20).

This completes the proof of the existence of Killing spinors. Once one has a spinor ε that satisfies the above constraints, one substitutes it into the Killing spinor equations (4.5) and (4.9) − (4.12) to obtain the explicit Killing spinor solution.

As the last point in this Section, we would like to determine the the number of independent degrees of freedom in the Killing spinors, which is in turn related to the number of 4-d supersymmetries which are left unbroken by the supersymmetric configuration. The four-component spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}$ in 4-d are related to each other by the constraints (4.15) from the Killing spinor equations as well as the reality and chirality conditions (2.3) $-$ (2.8) on the original $2^{[\frac{n+4}{2}]}$-component Dirac spinor(s) in $(4+n)$-d.

The Killing spinor constraints (4.15) relate the upper and the lower components of the four-component spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}$'s, thus each reducing the number of degrees of freedom by a factor of 2. Reality and chirality conditions relate components of Dirac spinors (in $(4+n)$-d) and thus they further reduce the number of independent degrees. A Majorana condition on Dirac spinors reduces the number of independent degrees of freedom by another factor of 2, *i.e.*, a $(4+n)$-d Majorana spinor has $2^{[\frac{n+4}{2}]}$ real independent components while $(4+n)$-d $SU(2)$ and $USp(2)$ (pseudo-) Majorana spinors have $2^{[\frac{n+4}{2}]}$ complex independent degrees of freedom. In $D = 10$, one imposes a Majorana-Weyl condition on a Dirac spinor; in this case the number of independent components is further reduced by a factor of 2.

Now, for each $D = 4 + n$ with the minimal N extended SG, one obtains the following number of the left-over independent degrees for the spinors and the corresponding number of 4-d supersymmetries left intact by the supersymmetric spherical configurations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{d} = 5 \text{ KK theory}: \ 2 \text{ complex degrees of freedom } (N = 1) \\
&\mathrm{d} = 6, ..., 10 \text{ KK theories}: \begin{cases} 4 \text{ complex degrees of freedom } (N = 2), \ \text{for } Q = 0 \text{ or } P = 0 \\ 2 \text{ complex degrees of freedom } (N = 1), \ \text{for } Q \neq 0 \neq P \end{cases} \\
&\mathrm{d} = 11 \text{ KK theory}: \begin{cases} 8 \text{ complex degrees of freedom } (N = 4), \ \text{for } Q = 0 \text{ or } P = 0 \\ 4 \text{ complex degrees of freedom } (N = 2), \ \text{for } Q \neq 0 \neq P \ . \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

4.2. BOGOMOL'NYI BOUND

Finally, we would like to derive the Bogomol'nyi bound on the energy of the type of BH configurations, *i.e.*, electrically and magnetically charged static, spherically symmetric configurations, discussed in the beginning of Chapter 4. For that purpose we introduce the Nester-like two-form[4]:

$$\hat{E}^{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\bar{\varepsilon}\Gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\hat{\nabla}_\rho\varepsilon + c.c. \quad . \tag{4.24}$$

Here, one has to note that $\delta\psi_{\mu 4} \equiv \hat{\nabla}_\rho\varepsilon$ is the supersymmetry transformation for the 4-d "physical gravitino(s)". Namely, if the kinetic energy term for the gravitino in $(4+n)$-d of the form

$$\frac{i}{2}E\overline{\psi}_\Gamma\Gamma^{\Gamma\Lambda\Pi}D_\Lambda\psi_\Pi \quad , \tag{4.25}$$

where $E = \sqrt{-g^{(4+n)}}$, is expressed in terms of the components $\psi_\mu^{\mathbf{m}}$ ($\mu = 0, ..., 3$, $\mathbf{m} = 1, ...2^{[\frac{n}{2}]}$) and $\psi_{\tilde{\mu}}^{\mathbf{m}}$ ($\tilde{\mu} = 4, ..., (n+3)$), as discussed at the end of Chapter 3, then the kinetic energy term (4.25) is not diagonal in $\psi_\mu^{\mathbf{m}}$ and $\psi_{\tilde{\mu}}^{\mathbf{m}}$. Therefore, one has to perform Weyl-rescaling and field redefinition[34] in (4.25) in order to obtain the canonical kinetic energy terms for the physical gravitinos and fermions in 4-d. It turns out that the 4-d physical gravitino(s) $\psi_{\mu 4}^{\mathbf{m}}$ corresponds to the following combination(s) of $\psi_\mu^{\mathbf{m}}$ and $\psi_{\tilde{\mu}}^{\mathbf{m}}$:

$$\psi_{\mu 4}^{\mathbf{m}} \equiv \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{2\alpha}\varphi}e_\mu^a[\psi_\Lambda^{\mathbf{m}}E_a^\Lambda + \gamma_a\gamma_5(\gamma^{\tilde{a}})_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{m}}\psi_\Lambda^{\mathbf{n}}E_{\tilde{a}}^\Lambda] \quad . \tag{4.26}$$

Using (3.6) and (3.7), the supersymmetry transformation(s) on the physical gravitino(s) (Eq.(4.26)) can then be written in the following way:

$$\delta\psi_{\mu 4}^{\mathbf{m}} = \nabla_\mu\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}} - \frac{i}{4}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\sum_{\tilde{a}=4}^{n+3}\rho_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}\delta_\mu^\alpha\tilde{F}_{\alpha\beta}^{\tilde{a}}\gamma^\beta(\gamma^{\tilde{a}})_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{m}}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{n}} \quad , \tag{4.27}$$

where $\tilde{F}^{\tilde{a}\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2}e^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_i\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}F_{\alpha\beta}^{\tilde{a}}$ is the dual electromagnetic field strength tensor and $e = \sqrt{-g}$. Recall, $i \equiv (\tilde{a} - 3) = 1, ..., n$, $\rho_n = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}\rho_k^{-1}$ and $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{n}}$. In addition, one redefines the fermionic fields as follows:

$$\chi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}} \equiv \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\varphi}{2\alpha}} \psi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\Lambda} E^{\Lambda}_{\tilde{a}} \quad , \tag{4.28}$$

where $\tilde{a} = 4, ..., (n+3)$. Using again equations (3.6) and (3.7), one obtains the corresponding supersymmetry transformations given by

$$\delta\chi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}} = \frac{1}{8}\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_i^{\frac{1}{2}} F^{\tilde{a}}_{\mu\nu}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}} + \frac{1}{2n\alpha}\partial_\mu\varphi\gamma^\mu\gamma^5(\gamma^{\tilde{a}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{n}} + \frac{1}{4}\rho_i^{-1}\partial_\mu\rho_i\gamma^\mu\gamma^5(\gamma^{\tilde{a}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}\varepsilon^{\mathbf{n}} \quad . \tag{4.29}$$

In terms of the physical gravitinos (4.26) and the redefined scalar fields (4.28), the kinetic energy term (4.25) assumes the following canonical form:

$$\frac{i}{2}e\overline{\psi}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}D_\nu\psi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\rho} + \frac{i}{2}e\overline{\chi}^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}}(\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\gamma^{\tilde{b}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}} + \eta^{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}\delta^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}})\gamma^\mu D_\mu\chi^{\mathbf{n}}_{\tilde{b}} \quad , \tag{4.30}$$

where $D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4}\omega_{\mu ab}\gamma^{ab}$ is the 4-d gravitational covariant derivative on fermionic fields.

Derivation of the Bogomol'nyi bound consists of evaluating the surface integral of the Nester's two-form (4.24), which is related through the Stokes theorem to the volume integral of its covariant derivative in the following way:

$$\int_{\Sigma} dS_\mu e\nabla_\nu\hat{E}^{\mu\nu} = \int_{\Sigma} dS_\mu\partial_\nu(e\hat{E}^{\mu\nu}) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dS_{\mu\nu}e\hat{E}^{\mu\nu} \quad , \tag{4.31}$$

where Σ is a space-like hypersurface with the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ at spatial infinity. With the given supersymmetry transformation(s) (4.27) of the physical 4-d gravitino(s), the Nester two-form (4.24) reduces to the following expression:

$$\hat{E}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}[\bar{\varepsilon}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\nabla_\rho\varepsilon + i\bar{\varepsilon}\{\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\sum_{\tilde{a}=4}^{n+3}\rho_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{F}^{\tilde{a}\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\gamma^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\tilde{F}^{\tilde{a}}_{\alpha\beta})\otimes\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\}\varepsilon] + c.c. \quad . \tag{4.32}$$

As will be shown in the next chapter, space-time of the configuration is asymptotically flat and the spinor ε approaches a constant, ε_∞, as $r \to \infty$. So, the surface integral in (4.31) is evaluated to be

$$\int\limits_{\partial\Sigma} dS_{\mu\nu} e \hat{E}^{\mu\nu} = (\bar{\varepsilon}_\infty \gamma^\mu \varepsilon_\infty) P^{ADM}_\mu + \sum_{\tilde{a}=4}^{n+3} \overline{\varepsilon}_\infty \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi_\infty} \rho_{i\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} (iP^{\tilde{a}} - \gamma_5 Q^{\tilde{a}}) \otimes \gamma^{\tilde{a}} \varepsilon_\infty \quad , \qquad (4.33)$$

where P^{ADM}_μ is the ADM 4-momentum[2] and the physical charges of the system are defined as $Q^{\tilde{a}} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dS_{\mu\nu} F^{\tilde{a}\mu\nu}$ and $P^{\tilde{a}} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial\Sigma} dS_{\mu\nu} e(\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varphi}\rho_i^{-1}\tilde{F}^{\tilde{a}\mu\nu})$. The the subscript ∞ denotes the asymptotic value of a field as $r \to \infty$.

The volume integral in Eq.(4.31) is more involved and a lengthy calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{\Sigma} dS_\mu e \nabla_\nu \hat{E}^{\mu\nu} = \int\limits_{\Sigma} dS_\mu e [& -\frac{1}{2}(\overline{\hat{\nabla}_\nu \varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}}) \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} \hat{\nabla}_\rho \varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}} + \frac{1}{2}(\overline{\delta\chi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}}})[\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^{\tilde{a}}\gamma^{\tilde{b}})^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}} + \eta^{\tilde{a}\tilde{b}}\delta^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{n}}]\gamma^\mu(\delta\chi^{\mathbf{n}}_{\tilde{b}}) \\ & + (G^{\mu\nu} - T^{\mu\nu})(\overline{\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}}\gamma_\nu \varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}) + c.c.] \quad ,\end{aligned} \qquad (4.34)$$

where $T^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g}}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{matt}}{\partial g_{\mu\nu}}$ is the stress-energy tensor for matter (gauge fields, the dilaton and scalar fields) terms. The first term in the integrand on the right hand side (RHS) of Eq.(4.34) is non-negative for spinors ε satisfying the (modified) Witten's condition, *i.e.*, $n \cdot \hat{\nabla}\varepsilon = 0$ (n is the 4-vector normal to Σ), which is shown[35] to have a solution for an asymptotically flat space-time provided the spinor approaches a constant value as $r \to \infty$. The last term on the RHS of Eq.(4.34) vanishes due to the Einstein equation $G^{\mu\nu} = T^{\mu\nu}$. Therefore, (4.33) is non-negative and vanishes, provided the supersymmetry transformations (4.27) and (4.29) of the physical 4-d gravitinos $\psi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\mu 4}$ and the fermions $\chi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{a}}$ are zero. Note that vanishing of (4.27) and (4.29) is equivalent to vanishing of the supersymmetry transformations (3.6) and (3.7) of the decomposed $(n+4)$-d gravitino ψ_Π, *i.e.*, $\delta\psi^{\mathbf{m}}_\mu = \delta\psi^{\mathbf{m}}_{\tilde{\mu}} = 0$.

For non-supersymmetric configurations, (4.34) implies that the bilinear form (4.33) is positive. The necessary and sufficient condition for (4.33) to be positive is that all the eigenvalues of the Hermitian matrix sandwiched between the spinor ε_∞ are positive. Since the matrix in the first term on the RHS of (4.33) commutes with the matrix in the second term (this can be easily seen by going into the reference frame of the configuration, *i.e.*, the frame where the ADM energy-momentum P^{ADM}_μ has only time-component), the ADM mass of the configuration, *i.e.*, the eigenvalue of the matrix in the first term, has to be greater than the largest eigenvalue of the matrix in the second term.[⋆] We have seen that the supersymmetric configurations prefer the vacua with two $U(1)$ gauge factors. It is therefore of interest for us to consider only two non-zero gauge fields, which are without loss of generality taken to be associated with the last two internal coordinates. Then, applying the prescription stated in the footnote, we obtain the following Bogomol'nyi bound for non-supersymmetric $U(1) \times U(1)$ configurations:

$$M > \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi_\infty}\sqrt{(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(n-1)\infty}|P^{n+2}| + \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}_{n\infty}|Q^{n+3}|)^2 + (\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(n-1)\infty}|Q^{n+2}| + \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}_{n\infty}|P^{n+3}|)^2} \tag{4.35}$$

This bound reduces to the one of Gibbons and Perry's 5-d KK BH solutions in the limit that either of gauge fields vanishes, say, $P^{n+2} = Q^{n+2} = 0$.

However, for supersymmetric configurations Eq.(4.33) has meaning only when the isometry group of the internal space is $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$. Otherwise, the constraints on the spinor ε_∞ cannot be satisfied, as discussed in the beginning of this Chapter. Say, for the gauge field associated with the $(n+2)^{th}$-dimension being magnetic and the gauge field associated with the $(n+3)^{th}$-dimension being electric, the spinor constraints $\gamma^{n+2}\varepsilon_{\ell\infty} = i\eta_m\varepsilon_{u\infty}$ and $\gamma^{n+3}\varepsilon_{\ell\infty} = \eta_e\varepsilon_{u\infty}$ ($\eta_{e,m} = \pm 1$) select out magnetic charge P^{n+2} from the second to the last term and electric charge Q^{n+3} from the last term in the second term of Eq.(4.33). Therefore, the ADM mass of the supersymmetric configuration becomes:

$$M_{ext} = \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi_\infty}(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}}_{n\infty}|P^{n+2}| + \rho^{\frac{1}{2}}_{(n-1)\infty}|Q^{n+3}|) \quad . \tag{4.36}$$

[⋆] One of ways of determining the largest eigenvalue of the matrix in the second term is to consider all the possible sets of commuting matrices in the second term and to express the matrix in the second term in a form of sum of mutually anticommuting matrices whose eigenvalues are known. Then, the largest eigenvalue can be found by applying the following theorem: if matrices A_i have eigenvalues a_i and A_i's are mutually anticommuting, then the matrix $\sum_{i=1}^m A_i$ has eigenvalues $\pm\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m (a_i)^2}$. This method can be applied to the case of even number of internal dimensions, only.

This is the right expression for the ADM mass that saturates the bound (4.35) in the case of the $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$ group.

5. Supersymmetric 4-d Kaluza-Klein Solutions

We shall now obtain the explicit form of the supersymmetric 4-d charged Kaluza-Klein (KK) black hole (BH) solutions satisfying the Killing spinor equations as specified by vanishing of the supersymmetry transformations (3.6) and (3.7).

We have shown in Chapter 4 that the maximal symmetry of the internal space allowed by supersymmetric static spherical configurations is $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$. Without loss of generality, we choose the electromagnetic vector potential associated with the second to the last coordinate to be magnetic and that corresponding to the last coordinate to be electric:

$$A_\mu^{n+2} = \delta_\mu^\varphi P(1-\cos\theta) \qquad\qquad A_\mu^{n+3} = \delta_\mu^t \psi(r) \quad , \tag{5.1}$$

where $E(r) = -\partial_r \psi(r) = \frac{\tilde{Q}}{R e^{\alpha\varphi}\rho_n}$.

The aim is now to obtain the explicit solutions for the 4-d metric components (Eq.(4.2)), the internal radii (Eq.(4.1)) and the dilaton $\varphi(r)$ from the Killing spinor equations (4.5) and (4.9) $-$ (4.12). However, before obtaining the first order coupled differential equations for these fields, we have to determine the angular coordinate dependence of the spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}$. For this purpose, we multiply (4.10) by $\gamma^1 \sin\theta$ and (4.11) by γ^2. Then we subtract the two and then multiply by γ^2 to get the equation

$$[2\partial_\phi + \gamma^1\gamma^2\cos\theta - 2(\gamma^1\gamma^2\sin\theta)\partial_\theta]\varepsilon_u^{\mathbf{m}} = 0 \quad . \tag{5.2}$$

This fixes the angular coordinate dependence[36] of the spinor to be

$$(\varepsilon_u^{1,\mathbf{m}}, \varepsilon_u^{2,\mathbf{m}}) = e^{i\sigma^2\theta/2} e^{i\sigma^3\phi/2} (a_u^{1,\mathbf{m}}(r), a_u^{2,\mathbf{m}}(r)) \quad , \tag{5.3}$$

where $a_u^{\mathbf{m}}(r)$'s are two-component spinors which depend on the radial coordinate, only. The same relation holds for the lower two-component spinors $\varepsilon_\ell^{\mathbf{m}}$. Constraints on $a_{u,\ell}^{\mathbf{m}}(r)$ are the same as those of $\varepsilon_{u,\ell}^{\mathbf{m}}$, *i.e.*, Eq.(4.15) with $\varepsilon_{u,\ell}$ replaced by $a_{u,\ell}$.

Given the Ansätze for the gauge fields (5.1), and the constraints (4.15) and (5.3) on spinors, one can solve the Killing spinor equations (equations (4.5) and (4.9) through (4.12)) to get the following differential equations for the 4-d metric coefficients $\lambda(r)$ and $R(r)$ in equation (4.2), the internal radii $\rho_i(r)$ $(i = 1, ..., n)$ and the dilaton $\varphi(r)$ as well as the spinors $a_u^{\mathbf{m}}(r)$:

$$\lambda' - \frac{1}{\alpha}\lambda\partial_r\varphi - \eta_e\tilde{Q}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}R^{-1} = 0 \tag{5.4}$$

$$\sqrt{\lambda R}\left(\frac{R'}{R} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r\varphi\right) - \eta_m P\mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_{n-1}^{\frac{1}{2}}R^{-\frac{1}{2}} = 2 \tag{5.5}$$

$$\partial_r a_u^{\mathbf{m}} - \frac{1}{4}\eta_e\tilde{Q}\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}}R^{-1}a_u^{\mathbf{m}} = 0 \tag{5.6}$$

$$\frac{1}{n\alpha}\partial_r\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\rho_i^{-1}\partial_r\rho_i = 0 \quad , \quad i = 1, ..., n-2 \tag{5.7}$$

$$PR^{-1} + 2\eta_m\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_{n-1}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{n\alpha}\partial_r\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\rho_{n-1}^{-1}\partial_r\rho_{n-1}\right) = 0 \tag{5.8}$$

$$\tilde{Q}R^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\alpha\varphi}\rho_n^{-1} + 2\eta_e\mathrm{e}^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi}\rho_n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{1}{n\alpha}\partial_r\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\rho_n^{-1}\partial_r\rho_n\right) = 0 \quad . \tag{5.9}$$

Recall, $\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{n+2}{n}}$, $\rho_n = \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}\rho_k^{-1}$ and $\eta_{e,m} = \pm 1$.

We shall now solve these equations to obtain the supersymmetric solutions for charged static spherical configurations. The 4-d metric components λ and R are related by the following equation:

$$\partial_r\sqrt{\lambda R} = 1 \quad , \tag{5.10}$$

which can be solved to yield

$$\lambda R = (r - r_H)^2 \quad , \tag{5.11}$$

where r_H is the event horizon, *i.e.* $\lambda(r_H) = 0$. Eq.(5.7) is integrated to yield the expressions for ρ_i $(i = 1, ..., n-2)$ in terms of φ:

$$\rho_i = \rho_{i\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{2}{n\alpha}(\varphi - \varphi_\infty)} \quad , \quad i = 1, ..., n-2 \quad , \tag{5.12}$$

and equations (5.5) and (5.8) with (5.11) are solved to give the following relation of ρ_{n-1} to λ and φ:

$$\rho_{n-1} = \rho_{(n-1)\infty} \lambda \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{2-n}{n\alpha}(\varphi - \varphi_\infty)} \quad , \tag{5.13}$$

where the subscript ∞ denotes the asymptotic values of fields at infinity.

Making use of the relations (5.11) through (5.13) among the fields associated with the internal metric and the 4-d metric components, we can rewrite the equations (5.4) and (5.5) entirely in terms of the 4-d metric components and the dilaton field φ:

$$\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda} - \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r \varphi - \eta_e \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi - \varphi_\infty)} \frac{\mathbf{Q}}{R} = 0 \tag{5.14}$$

$$\frac{\lambda'}{\lambda} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r \varphi + \eta_m \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi - \varphi_\infty)} \frac{\mathbf{P}}{R} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.15}$$

where we have defined the following "screened" electric and magnetic charges:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q} &\equiv \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi_\infty} \rho_{n\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} Q \\ \mathbf{P} &\equiv \mathrm{e}^{\frac{\alpha}{2}\varphi_\infty} \rho_{(n-1)\infty}^{\frac{1}{2}} P \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Here, Q and P are the respective physical electric and magnetic charges (see comments after Eq.(4.4), where the relationship between $\tilde{Q}$ and the physical electric charge Q is discussed). Note that the ADM mass of the extreme configuration (Eq.(4.36)) also depends only on the screened charges $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P}$. In addition, notice the symmetry of the above two equations under the electro-magnetic duality transformations, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{P} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ and $\varphi \to -\varphi$. Subtracting the above two equations, we obtain the following equation

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r\varphi + \frac{1}{2}\eta_m \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)}\frac{\mathbf{P}}{R} + \frac{1}{2}\eta_e \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)}\frac{\mathbf{Q}}{R} = 0 \quad , \tag{5.17}$$

which confirms a *no-hair* theorem, *i.e.*, the constant dilaton field with zero electromagnetic fields ($P = Q = 0$).

Multiplying Eq.(5.14) by $\eta_m \mathbf{P} \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)}$ and Eq.(5.15) by $\eta_e \mathbf{Q} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)}$, followed by addition of the two equations, gives the equation which is solved to be

$$\lambda = \frac{\eta_e \mathbf{Q} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)} + \eta_m \mathbf{P} \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)}}{\eta_e \mathbf{Q} + \eta_m \mathbf{P}} \quad . \tag{5.18}$$

This expression relates the 4-d metric coefficient λ and the value of the dilaton φ, and it reduces to the following special relations:

$$\varphi = -\alpha \ln \lambda + \varphi_\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi = \alpha \ln \lambda + \varphi_\infty \quad , \tag{5.19}$$

which correspond to the purely electrically charged ($P = 0$) and the purely magnetically charged ($Q = 0$) BH's, respectively. We substitute (5.18) into (5.17), making use of (5.11), in order to get the following ordinary differential equation for the dilaton field φ:

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_r\varphi + \frac{1}{2(r-r_H)^2}\left[\eta_e \mathbf{Q} \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)} + \eta_m \mathbf{P} \mathrm{e}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)}\right]^2 \frac{1}{\eta_e \mathbf{Q} + \eta_m \mathbf{P}} = 0 \quad . \tag{5.20}$$

Note once again the symmetry of (5.20) under the electro-magnetic duality transformation. This equation can be easily solved to give the explicit solution for the dilaton field:

$$\mathrm{e}^{\frac{2}{\alpha}(\varphi-\varphi_\infty)} = \frac{r - r_H + \eta_e \mathbf{Q}}{r - r_H - \eta_m \mathbf{P}} = \frac{r - |\mathbf{P}|}{r - |\mathbf{Q}|} \tag{5.21}$$

where we have identified $r_H = \eta_e \mathbf{Q} - \eta_m \mathbf{P}$. Also, we have chosen the signs of η_m and η_e ($\eta_{e,m} = \pm 1$) so that $\eta_e \mathbf{Q} = |\mathbf{Q}|$ and $-\eta_m \mathbf{P} = |\mathbf{P}|$. Then, we substitute

(5.21) into (5.18) to obtain the explicit solution for λ:

$$\lambda = \frac{r - |\mathbf{Q}| - |\mathbf{P}|}{(r - |\mathbf{Q}|)^{\frac{1}{2}}(r - |\mathbf{P}|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad , \tag{5.22}$$

and by using (5.11) the following solution for R is obtained:

$$R = r^2(1 - \frac{|\mathbf{Q}| + |\mathbf{P}|}{r})(1 - \frac{|\mathbf{Q}|}{r})^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \frac{|\mathbf{P}|}{r})^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad . \tag{5.23}$$

The following solution for the electric field:

$$E(r) = \frac{Q}{Re^{\alpha(\varphi - \varphi_\infty)}(\rho_n/\rho_{n\infty})} = \frac{Q}{(r - |\mathbf{P}|)^2} \tag{5.24}$$

is obtained by substituting the explicit solutions for R, φ and ρ_n into the formula derived from the Euler-Lagrangian equation for the electric field. The electric field has different radial dependence from that of the axionic dyon solutions: its radial dependence is shifted by $|\mathbf{P}|$.

Finally, the radial coordinate dependence of the 4-d spinors is fixed by equation (5.6) with the known solutions (5.12), (5.13) and (5.21):

$$a_u^{\mathbf{m}}(r) = a_{u\infty}^{\mathbf{m}} \left(\frac{r - |\mathbf{Q}| - |\mathbf{P}|}{r - |\mathbf{P}|} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \quad . \tag{5.25}$$

Note that the spinors $\varepsilon^{\mathbf{m}}$ do asymptotically approach constant spinors $\varepsilon_{u\infty}^{\mathbf{m}}$ as $r \to \infty$. For $Q = 0$, they are independent of the radial coordinate. Otherwise, they approach zero at the horizon.

Although the solution (5.21) for the dilaton field φ depends explicitly on n (the number of internal dimensions) the 4-d metric coefficients (5.22) and (5.23) as well as the Killing spinors, determined by equations (5.3) and (5.25), do not. *Supersymmetry, by means of the Killing spinor equations, renders the scalar fields* ρ_i *to collaborate with the dilaton field* φ*, through* (5.12) *and* (5.13)*, in such a way that* *the 4-d space-time properties of the configuration are independent of dimensionality of the internal space.* In addition, in the limit that either Q or P vanishes, solutions for the 4-d metric components λ and R reduce to those of the 4-d supersymmetric BH's in 5-d KK theory.[11]

The above properties of solutions (5.22) and (5.23) can be understood by calculating the effective on-shell action (this we mean by considering the equations for the scalar fields only) for supersymmetric configurations, *i.e.*, by considering the Lagrangian of the bosonic fields associated with this class of configurations. From equations (5.12) and (5.13), we can see that the following combinations of the scalar fields and λ are constants:

$$\begin{aligned} &\ln\rho_i + \frac{2}{n\alpha}\varphi = const. \qquad\qquad i = 1, ..., n-2 \\ &\ln(\rho_{n-1}\lambda^{-1}) + \frac{2-n}{n\alpha}\varphi = const. \qquad \ln(\rho_n\lambda) + \frac{2-n}{n\alpha}\varphi = const. \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

where we have to keep in mind that $\rho_n \equiv \prod_{k=1}^{n-1}\rho_k^{-1}$. The above relations provide us with a hint that it is convenient to introduce new scalar fields χ_i and Φ, which represent the same physical degrees of freedom as the old set φ and ρ_i. The new fields are defined in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Phi \equiv \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\alpha}\varphi \qquad\qquad \chi_i \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\ln\rho_i + \frac{2}{n\alpha}\varphi] \ , \quad i = 1, ..., n-2 \\ &\chi_{n-1} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\ln\rho_{n-1} + \frac{2-n}{n\alpha}\varphi] \qquad \chi_n \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[\ln\rho_n + \frac{2-n}{n\alpha}\varphi] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

Note $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\chi_i = 0$. Then, the Lagrangian density (3.4) expressed in terms of the above new fields becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}} = -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-g}[\mathcal{R} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\Phi\partial^\mu\Phi - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\partial_\mu\chi_i\partial^\mu\chi_i - \partial_\mu\Phi(\partial^\mu\chi_{n-1} + \partial^\mu\chi_n) \\ + \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{e}^{\sqrt{2}(\Phi+\chi_{n-1})}F^{n+2}_{\mu\nu}F^{n+2\ \mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{e}^{\sqrt{2}(\Phi+\chi_n)}F^{n+3}_{\mu\nu}F^{n+3\ \mu\nu}] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

Since the fields χ_i $(i = 1, ..., (n-2))$ couple in the above Lagrangian density only through the 4-d metric, the solutions to the Euler-Lagrangian equations of these fields are $\chi_i = \chi_{i\infty} = const.$ $(i = 1, ..., (n-2))$, which in turn implies $\chi_{n-1}+\chi_n = \chi_{(n-1)\infty}+\chi_{n\infty} = const.$. The left-over part of the on-shell Lagrangian density is then of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}' = -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-g}[\mathcal{R} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\Phi\partial^\mu\Phi - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\chi_{n-1}\partial^\mu\chi_{n-1} - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\chi_n\partial^\mu\chi_n \\ + \frac{1}{4}e^{\sqrt{2}(\Phi+\chi_{n-1})}F^{n+2}_{\mu\nu}F^{n+2\ \mu\nu} + \frac{1}{4}e^{\sqrt{2}(\Phi+\chi_n)}F^{n+3}_{\mu\nu}F^{n+3\ \mu\nu}]\ .\end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}'$ is indeed independent of dimensionality n of the internal space and is effectively that of 6-d Kaluza-Klein theory. In terms of the new scalar fields, the explicit solutions and the relations among the new scalar fields and the metric component λ are

$$\begin{aligned}e^{\sqrt{2}(\Phi-\Phi_\infty)} &= \frac{r-|\mathbf{P}|}{r-|\mathbf{Q}|} \\ \chi_{(n-1),n} &= \pm\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\ln\lambda + \chi_{(n-1),n\ \infty} \\ \lambda &= \frac{|\mathbf{Q}|e^{-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Phi-\Phi_\infty)} - |\mathbf{P}|e^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Phi-\Phi_\infty)}}{|\mathbf{Q}|-|\mathbf{P}|}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

where + (or −) in the second equation is for χ_{n-1} (or χ_n) and the screened charges $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are defined, in a manner similar to those of Eq.(5.16), as $e^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Phi_\infty+\chi_{n\infty})}Q$ and $e^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Phi_\infty+\chi_{(n-1)\infty})}P$, respectively.

When one of the charges is zero, say, $P = 0$, one field combination, *i.e.*, $\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}(\Phi - \chi_n)$ becomes constant, and the other one, *i.e.*, $\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}(\Phi + \chi_n)$, corresponds to the dilaton with the dilaton-Maxwell coupling $\alpha = \sqrt{3}$. Namely, in this case the Lagrangian density (5.29) reduces to the one of 4-d BH's in 5-d KK theory.

We would like to conclude with a comment about the nature of allowed charges for supersymmetric configurations. Note that 4-d supersymmetric BH's in 5-d KK theory can have only one charge, *i.e.*, either Q or P.[⋆] In the presence of

---

[⋆] Note also that the Killing spinor equations for charged dilatonic BH's with arbitrary values of the coupling α, as given in Ref.13, can be solved either for non-zero Q or for non-zero P only, but not both.

the dilaton, continuous duality transformation,[37,38] which can be used to generate dyonic solutions from single-charged solutions, must involve the axion field. Thus, the existence of supersymmetric (dilatonic) monopole solutions does not necessarily ensure the existence of supersymmetric dyonic solutions, unless there is the axion field.[†] For our solutions, which correspond to the case without the axion field, each of gauge fields $A^{\tilde{a}}_\mu$ is forced to have either electric or magnetic charge, but not both.

5.1. SINGULARITY STRUCTURE AND THERMAL PROPERTIES

We would now like to study 4-d space-time of the configurations as determined by the 4-d metric coefficients (5.22) and (5.23). There is a singularity at $r = r_H$, *i.e.*, the Ricci scalar $\mathcal{R}$ blows up there. Even though proper space-like distance from a point $r_0 > r_H$ to $r = r_H$ is finite, *i.e.*, $L = \int_{r_H}^{r_0} \lambda^{-\frac{1}{2}} dr < \infty$, corresponding affine time τ, *i.e.*, time it takes for an outside observer at r_0 to observe null signals coming from $r = r_H$, is *infinite.* Namely, with the explicit solution (5.22) for $\lambda(r)$, one finds $\tau = \int_{r_H}^{r_0} dr \sqrt{\frac{g_{rr}}{g_{tt}}} \;=\; \int_{r_H}^{r_0} dr \lambda^{-1}(r) \;=\; \infty$. Thus, *the singularity coincides with the horizon*, *i.e.*, it is a null singularity. In the limit that either Q or P is zero, the singularity becomes naked.[8] In Figs. 1a and 1b, the Penrose diagrams (in the (r,t) plane) are given respectively for the case with both charges non-zero and the case with one charge set to zero.

We would now like to discuss the thermal properties of these solutions. Hawking's original calculation[40] of the temperature of a static BH involved the Bogoliubov transformation between two bases modes of two asymptotically flat "in" and "out" regions. Later, it was realized[41] that the temperature T_H associated with the horizon can be identified with the inverse of the imaginary time period of a functional path integral.[‡] In Euclidean space-time, *i.e.*, by performing analytic

---

[†] Of course, *non-supersymmetric* 4-d BH's in 5-d KK theory are allowed to have both charges (see, for example, Ref.20). In this case, monopole solutions and dyonic solutions are not related through the continuous duality transformations. For other examples of supersymmetric dyonic solutions, see Ref.10 and Ref.39.

[‡] Alternatively, one can calculate T_H from the surface gravity term.[42]

Figure 1 The Penrose diagram (in the (r,t) plane) for a supersymmetric configuration with *both* charges (Q and P) non-zero, and the one for a supersymmetric configuration with one charge (Q or P) zero are given in Fig.1a and Fig.1b, respectively. Note a null singularity (jagged line) in the former case, and a naked singularity in the latter case.

continuation $t \to it$, the functional path integral becomes a thermodynamic partition function of a system in equilibrium with the thermal bath of temperature T_H. Namely, after imposing imaginary time periodicity of fields, the amplitude becomes $< \phi_1 | \exp[-i\mathcal{H}(t_2 - t_1)] | \phi_1 > = \operatorname{Tr}\exp(-\beta\mathcal{H})$ if one sets $t_2 - t_1 = -i\beta$ ($\beta = T_H^{-1}$). Here $\mathcal{H}$ is the Hamiltonian for the system.

In order to determine the imaginary time period for our configurations, we consider a portion of the metric (4.2) in the (r-t) plane:

$$ds^2 = \lambda(r)dt^2 - \lambda^{-1}(r)dr^2 \quad . \tag{5.31}$$

Near the event horizon r_H, $\lambda(r) \approx \lambda'(r_H)\rho$, where $\rho \equiv r - r_H \approx 0$. After redefinition of the radial coordinate $\eta \equiv 2\sqrt{\rho/\lambda'(r_H)}$ and analytic continuation to imaginary time $\tau \equiv it$, the metric (5.31) transforms into

$$ds^2 = -d\eta^2 - \frac{(\lambda'(r_H))^2}{4}\eta^2 d\tau^2 \quad . \tag{5.32}$$

This metric is the metric for the flat 2-d plane in the polar-coordinate with η and τ identified as the radial and the angular coordinates, respectively. In order to avoid a conical singularity at $\rho = 0$, one has to impose periodicity of the coordinate $\tau = it$ with the period $\frac{4\pi}{|\lambda'(r_H)|}$. Therefore, the Hawking temperature of the BH is

$$T_H = \frac{|\lambda'(r_H)|}{4\pi} \quad . \tag{5.33}$$

Substituting the explicit solution (5.22) into (5.33), one has

$$T_H = \frac{1}{4\pi\sqrt{|\mathbf{PQ}|}} \quad , \tag{5.34}$$

where the screened charges ($\mathbf{Q}$,$\mathbf{P}$) are defined in terms of the physical charges (Q, P) in Eq.(5.16). *The temperature T_H is finite.* In the limit of single-charged solutions ($Q = 0$ or $P = 0$) T_H, however, diverges.[8]

Entropy S of the system can be calculated following the Bekenstein's prescription[43] that $S = \frac{1}{4}\times$(the surface area of the event horizon). The explicit solution (5.23) shows that S goes to zero despite finite T_H for the extreme BH. The fact that entropy, interpreted as a measure of the number of available states,[44] goes to zero at finite temperature seems to indicate that there is a finite *mass gap* of order T_H between the extreme BH ground state and its lowest excited states.[45] An analysis regarding the issues of the breakdown of the standard semi-classical treatment of the BH thermodynamics[45] has to be postponed until the non-extreme solutions are obtained. However, in our case there is no ambiguity (as extensively studied in Ref.10) in taking different limits, when calculating T_H and S for our configurations. Namely, taking one of the charges equal to zero followed by taking the extreme limit, and taking the extreme limit with $P \neq 0 \neq Q$ followed by taking either of the charges equal to zero give the same answers for T_H and S.

6. Conclusions

We have derived a class of 4-d supersymmetric charged dilatonic black hole (BH) solutions, arising in the compactification of higher dimensional ($5 \leq D \equiv (4+n) \leq 11$) supergravity theories. Such configurations satisfy the Killing spinor equations (formally for any $n \geq 1$) and saturate the corresponding Bogomol'nyi bound for their ADM masses.

We started with an Abelian internal symmetry group $G = U(1)^n$ and used static spherical Ansätze for the 4-d space-time metric and the fields associated with the internal metric. It turned out that supersymmetric configurations select out among n $U(1)$ gauge factors only *two* $U(1)$ factors, each of them with a different type of charge, *i.e.*, $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$ is the internal symmetry of vacuum states. Such configurations therefore correspond to dyonic BH's with their magnetic (P) and electric (Q) charges arising from *different* $U(1)$ gauge group factors. Contrary to previous expectations, supersymmetric 4-d BH solutions of all the ($4+n$)-d Kaluza-Klein (KK) theories look effectively like those of 6-d KK theory; supersymmetry renders scalar fields, associated with the $(n-2)$ internal radii, to conspire with the dilaton field φ in such a way that the effective theories in 4-d are independent of n, dimensionality of the internal space. When either Q or P is zero, these solutions reduce to 4-d supersymmetric BH's in 5-d KK theory.

For configurations with $Q \neq 0$ and $P \neq 0$, the ADM mass is $M_{ext} = \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{P}$, 4-d space-time has a null singularity, the Hawking temperature is finite ($T_H = 1/(4\pi\sqrt{|\mathbf{QP}|})$ and entropy is zero. Here ($\mathbf{Q}$,$\mathbf{P}$) correspond to charges, screened by asymptotic constant values of the dilaton and the corresponding internal radii (see Eq.(5.16)). Note, however, that for Q or $P = 0$ 4-d space-time has a naked singularity and infinite temperature.

We assumed that the internal isometry group G is Abelian. In this case, different supersymmetric static spherical solutions spontaneously break G down to different $U(1)_E \times U(1)_M$ factors as the vacuum configurations. We suspect that the same thing will happen for axially symmetric stationary configurations, but it remains to be proven. Our work also provides a starting point for a systematic study of the corresponding non-extreme solutions, *e.g.*, their singularity structure and thermal properties.

Supersymmetric non-Abelian BH solutions, *i.e.*, G being non-Abelian, may provide another interesting generalization of our work. On the other hand, inclusion of other fields, *e.g.*, gauge fields and anti-symmetric tensor fields, of higher-dimensional supergravity theories provides another possible generalization of the present work. In this case, one has to decompose $(4+n)$-d gauge fields and anti-symmetric tensors, which in 4-d may yield new type of terms with the dilaton-Maxwell couplings. Such terms might in turn lead to dilatonic BH solutions with the coupling α which could depend on dimensionality n of the internal space.

Acknowledgments The work is supported by U.S. DOE Grant No. DOE-EY-

76-02-3071. M. C. would like to thank R. Khuri for an interesting discussion and CERN for hospitality during the completion of the work.

REFERENCES

1. E.B. Bogomol'nyi, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24** (1976) 449.
2. R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C.W. Misner, Phys. Rev. **122** (1961) 997; L.F. Abbott and S. Deser, Nucl. Phys. **B195** (1982) 76.
3. Y. Choquet-Bruhat and J. Marsden, Commun. Math. Phys. **51** (1976) 283; R. Shoen and S.T. Yau, Comm. Math. Phys. **65** (1979) 45; **79** (1981) 231.
4. E. Witten, Comm. Math. Phys. **80** (1981) 381; J. Nester, Phys. Lett. **83A** (1981) 241.
5. G.W. Gibbons and C.M. Hull, Phys. Lett. **109B** (1982) 190; G.W. Gibbons, G. Horowitz, S.W. Hawking and M. Perry, Comm. Math. Phys. **88** (1983) 295.
6. C. Callan, J. Harvey and A. Strominger, *Supersymmetric String Solitons*, preprint EFI-91-66 (1991).
7. M. Cvetič, S. Griffies and S.-J. Rey, Nucl. Phys. **B381** (1992) 301; M. Cvetič and S. Griffies, Phys. Lett. **285B** (1992) 27.
8. G.W. Gibbons, Nucl. Phys. **B207** (1982) 337; G.W. Gibbons and K. Maeda, Nucl. Phys **B298** (1988) 741; D. Garfinkle, G. Horowitz and A. Strominger, Phys. Rev. **D43** (1991) 3140; C.F.E. Holzhey and F. Wilczek, Nucl. Phys. **B380** (1992) 447.
9. M. Cvetič, UPR-596-T preprint (1993), hep-th # 93121, to appear in the *Proceedings of the International Conference on High Energy Physics*, Marseille, July 21-28, 1993 (World Scientific 1994); UPR-0600-T preprint (1994), hep-th # 9402089.
10. R. Kallosh, A. Linde, T. Ortín, A. Peet and A. van Proeyen, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 5278.
11. G.W. Gibbons and M. J. Perry, Nucl. Phys. **B248** (1984) 629.

12. M.J. Duff, R.R. Khuri, R. Minasian, J. Rahmfeld, Nucl. Phys. **B418** (1994) 195.

13. G.W. Gibbons, D. Kastor, L.A.J. London, P.K. Townsend and J. Traschen, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 880.

14. T. Kaluza, *Sitz. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.* **K1** (1921) 966; O. Klein, Z. Phys. **37** (1926) 895; T. Appelquist and A. Chodos, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 772; J. Scherk and J.H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B153** (1979) 61.

15. Y.M. Cho and P.G.O. Freund, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 1711; Y.M. Cho and Pong Soo Jang, Phys. Rev. **D12** (1975) 3789; Y.M. Cho, J. Math. Phys. **16** (1975) 2029.

16. Y.M. Cho, Phys. Rev. **D35** (1987) 2628.

17. D. Pollard, J. Phys. **A16** (1983) 565.

18. D.J. Gross and M.J. Perry, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1983) 29.

19. R.D. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 87.

20. G.W. Gibbons and D.L. Wiltshire, Ann. Phys. **167** (1986) 201.

21. Y.M. Cho and D.H. Park, J. Math. Phys. **31** (1990) 695.

22. W. Nahm, Nucl. Phys. **B135** (1978) 149.

23. C. Aragone and S. Deser, Phys. Lett. **86B** (1979) 161; T.L. Curtright, Phys. Lett. **85B** (1975) 219; F.A. Berends, J. W. van Holten, B. de Wit and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, J. Phys. **A13** (1980) 1643.

24. P.G.O. Freund, *Introduction to Supersymmetry*, (Cambridge University Press, 1986).

25. E. Cremmer, Supergravity in 5 dimensions, in *Superspace and Supergravity*, eds. S. W. Hawking and M. Roček (Cambridge University Press, 1981); M. Günaydin, G. Sierra and P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B242** (1984) 244; **B253** (1985) 573.

26. P.S. Howe, G. Sierra and P.K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B221** (1983) 331; R. D'Auria, P. Fré and T. Regge, Phys. Lett. **128B** (1983) 44; M. Awada, P.K. Townsend and G. Sierra, Class. Quant. Grav. **2** (1985) L85; H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, Phys. Lett. **144B** (1984) 187.

27. P.T. Townsend and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **125B** (1983) 41; E. Bergshoeff, I.G. Koh and E. Sezgin, Phys. Rev. **D32** (1985) 1353; M. Pernici, K. Pilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Lett. **143B** (1984) 103.

28. W. Awada and P.K. Townsend, Phys. Lett. **156B** (1985) 51.

29. S.J. Gates, H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, Class. Quant. Grav. **3** (1986) 21; M. Awada, P.K. Townsend, M. Günaydin and G. Sierra, Class. Quant. Grav. **2** (1985) 801.

30. A.H Chamseddine, Nucl. Phys. **B185** (1981) 403; E. Bergshoeff, M. De Roo, B. De Wit and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. **B195** (1982) 97; G.F. Chapline and N.S Manton, Phys. Lett. **120B** (1983) 105.

31. E. Cremmer and B. Julia, Phys. Lett. **76B** (1978) 409.

32. C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B211** (1983) 177; T. Kugo and P. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. **B221** (1983) 375.

33. C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. **B222** (1983) 20.

34. E. Cremmer and B. Julia, Nucl. Phys. **B159** (1979) 141.

35. Y. Choquet-Bruhat and D. Christodoulou, Acta. Math. **146** (1981) 124; T. Parker and C.H. Taubes, Commun. Math. Phys. **84** (1981) 124; O. Reula, J. Math. Phys. **23** (1982) 810.

36. M. Cvetič, S. Griffies and S.- J. Rey, Nucl. Phys. **B389** (1993) 3.

37. A. Shapere, S. Trivedi and F. Wilczek, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6** (1991) 2677.

38. E. Cremmer, J. Scherk and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. **74B** (1978) 61; A. Sen, Nucl. Phys. **B404** (1993) 109.

39. T. Ortín, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 3136.

40. S. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. **43** (1975) 199.

41. G.W. Gibbons and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 2752; G.W. Gibbons and M.J. Perry, Proc. R. Soc. London **A358** (1978) 467.

42. J.B. Hartle and S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. **D13** (1976) 2188.

43. J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 2333; **D9** (1974) 3292; S.W. Hawking, Phys. Rev. Lett. **26** (1971) 1344; J.M. Bardeen, B. Carter and S.W. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **31** (1973) 161; I. Moss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 1852; M. Visser, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 583; R. Kallosh, T. Ortín and A. Peet, **D47** (1993) 5400.

44. J.D. Bekenstein, Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 2333; **D12** (1975) 3077; **D13** (1976) 191.

45. P. Preskill, P. Schwarz, A. Shapere, S. Trivedi and F. Wilczek, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6** (1991) 2353.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9409119v1